

Henry J. Morganley
with all good wishes
4

Francis M. Anthon

Reprinted from QUEEN'S QUARTERLY, Vol. V, No. 1. July, 1897.

REPLY OF DR. KINGSFORD.

TO THE STRICTURES ON VOLUME VIII. OF THE HISTORY OF
CANADA IN THE REVIEW OF HISTORICAL PUBLICA-
TIONS RELATING TO CANADA.

ANY writer of a history, which embraces a period of importance, must look for differences of opinion to be entertained on many points included in his narrative; but he has the right to expect that such views are expressed with fairness and courtesy, and that the criticism to which he may be subjected is not advanced upon personal, but upon literary grounds. There is more than one school of thought in the estimate of public events and of public men, but there is only one standard of right and wrong, which in no case can with impunity be violated. The unfairness and the absence of honest representation with regard to the last volume of my history shown in the late publication issued under the authority of the University of Toronto bring this view forcibly into prominence*. Unless for the circumstance that the attack,

*University of Toronto Studies in History. Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada. Edited by George M. Wrong, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Toronto. Vol. 1, pp. 10-19.

it cannot be called a criticism, had been made under this authority, I should treat with disregard the opinions expressed, for there is little in the article to command respect or attract attention. Written anonymously, the editor of the publication must be responsible for its arrogance of tone, its acerbity of expression, and (what is of greater importance as affecting his character as a Professor of History) for the erroneous views it expresses regarding the facts of history and the superficial information it displays. Only that the statements made appear with the *imprimatur* of his University, I should allow them to pass unnoticed. Given to the world under the authority of the Senate, I feel called upon to reply lest my silence should be construed as an acceptance of their correctness.

I will briefly deal with the personal allusions to myself. I have to act in this case as many men have to do in a difficult position. I have to throw myself on my character and refer to the text of the book. Mr. Wrong, in his barbarous English, once before this occasion wrote of me that I was not a "stylist," whatever the word may mean; an expression to call forth from the Toronto press a contemptuous reproval, as he doubtless well remembers. My text can be adduced to show the character of the English I write, as well as the care taken by me to represent what I hold to be the truth. I am told that in this book there is an excessive amount of careless writing. If the defects claimed be admitted, they must not be attributed to this cause. My sheets in form were jealously read by a friend, to whose criticism they were subjected. From feelings of delicacy I do not mention his name. He is an associate of King's College, London, one of the highest honours attainable in the world of letters; a graduate of Oxford, where he took high honours and obtained a reputation rarely surpassed; in Montreal he is known by his brilliant and learned contributions to periodical literature, by his admirable and unsurpassed translations of Horace, and, among other writings, by a volume of poems of the highest merit. He is a member of the Royal Society. Although unnamed, his identity is sufficiently plain. If I wrote bad English, he is *particeps criminis* in allowing it to pass. He differs in his training and attainments from Mr. Wrong, as he surpasses him in learning, courtesy and reputation.

Who the unsigned critic may be I have yet to learn. This, however, may be said of him. He writes as one living in a petty parish community, imperfectly educated with some superficial, miscellaneous reading; with an unbounded admiration for obscure United States authorities, and with an unfathomable opinion of his own powers and merits; a living example of the truth of the oft-quoted French proverb, that *au royaume des aveugles les borgnes sont rois*.

This person complains of the want of sufficient references to my authorities. Any general accusation of this character is easily made and must go for what it is worth. In my humble judgment I have given all the references that are necessary. I was desirous of avoiding any complication of my text by irrelevant and unnecessary notes, and all cumbersome repetition of fact: an essential of all narrative. Notes, indeed, as a rule, are needed only when it is necessary to enforce attention to a disputed fact; or when an opinion expressed is at variance with the view generally entertained. It is likewise imputed to me as a literary crime that I have relied on what is to be found in the Canadian archives, the transcripts of the British official documents of the time, which furnish a true and reliable basis for historical narrative. It is also made a matter of accusation that I supplemented these researches by the British writers, James and Richardson, and that I fail to cite United States authorities, except those of eighty years ago. This writer fails to allude to my reference to Mr. Henry Adams, the author of the last published history of the presidential rule of Jefferson and Madison, when I "acknowledge my many obligations to him" for his "laboriously collected information." [Vol. VIII, p. 21.] He admits, however, that I cite the "prejudiced and untrustworthy Wilkinson" epithets easily explained, for Wilkinson is antagonistic to his theories of Procter's conduct at Sackett's Harbour.

Indeed, there is no point on which he fails generally to dilate, to shew, what I must be permitted to call, a vulgar acerbity in his effort to depreciate my work. He complains of my speed of production with the complacent remark, "that hasty work almost invariably results in faulty workmanship." I have been ten years exclusively engaged upon my history. A sum in arithmetic will prove that a volume a year is no astounding effort, when the

whole time of a writer is given to his subject. Four pages a day is but a moderate average of production; and 125 days of such work will give a volume of 500 pages, leaving 240 days for examination, research and proof reading. It is not easy to write of one's self, but I believe that I may say with propriety that it is known to my friends that I have avoided society; that I rose at five every morning of my life in summer and winter; that for hours I was a daily attendant, either at the parliamentary library or at the archives branch, and that I sought information wherever it could be gained. With these facts I am justified in considering that Mr. Wrong's anonymous writer is as impertinent as he is unjust, either in pronouncing on a matter of fact of which he must be ignorant, or if knowing the facts in deliberately misrepresenting them.

I refer to the text of this volume for the proof of the conscientious care with which I have striven to write, and I challenge both editor and writer to produce a passage which they consider as "obscure and unintelligible." The very opposite is the opinion of men capable of judging from education, training and literary *status*, uninfluenced by the malignity apparent throughout this attack.

I turn to the historical statements to which I feel called upon specially to reply. This writer disputes my assertion (p. 132) that Mr. Foster, the British Minister at Washington, failed to announce the declaration of war by the United States to Brock in Upper Canada, leaving the fact to be communicated by the Governor-General. He takes this ground on the authority of a United States letter, which states that one Vosburgh was arrested on his return from Queenston after delivering Foster's despatches. Mr. McTavish is named as the "person concerned." On this slender ground he conceives he has authority for the fact that such despatch was sent by Foster to Brock. The contrary is generally considered to be the case. The first intimation Brock received of the war was from a newspaper containing the president's message confirming the news, with a communication from McTavish, McGillivray & Co., affirming the fact. The official news only reached Montreal on the 7th of July, and the following day, the 8th, was sent forward to Brock. On the 10th Prevost wrote to Brock stating that from the disunion in the States the

"attempts on the Province must be feeble." At this time Hull was at Detroit preparing to invade Canada. There is no authority that Brock ever received such a despatch from the British minister. The party arrested may have brought letters to Canada; the probability is that it was the communication from McTavish, a partner in the firm by which the information was sent; indeed he is personally named as the "principal person concerned."*

On the authority of a despatch from Major-General Sheaffe, that Mr. Willcox (*sic*) was present at Queenston, the writer asserts that this person was the notorious traitor, Joseph Willcocks, who subsequently deserted to the United States, and was killed at Fort Erie towards the close of the war. There were others of the name, and very strong proof is required to establish that the "Willcox" named was the traitor Joseph Willcocks.

William Willcocks was a cousin of the Baldwin family. His history is given at some length by the late Mr. Dent in his *Canadian Portrait Gallery* [Vol. 1, p. 20]. Suffice it to say that he arrived in New York in 1797. Subsequently he reached York (Toronto), and it was by his influence that the elder Baldwin arrived in Canada in 1798; the grandfather of Robert Baldwin. His eldest son was established in Toronto, and subsequently mar-

*In order to show the want of value of the statements of this flippant, superficial writer, I append the narrative of the incident as given in the *Life and Correspondence of Sir Isaac Brock*, edited by his nephew, Ferdinand Brock Tupper (edition of 1847, pp. 188, 9). It is well known that this work is based on the MS. long in the possession of the general's last surviving brother, Savery. Its historical value is undisputed. The work has indeed taken its place in the national annals as a record of the man whose memory is held in universal reverence in the Dominion. The contradiction of this statement, as given in this volume on the shallow authority of a United States letter, relating a mere report, would scarcely have appeared possible except from the folly of this writer, who has adduced it as a warrant for the expression of a contrary opinion:

"Mr. Foster, the English minister at Washington, seems to have partaken of this delusion, for it does not appear that he had taken any precautionary measures to convey to the Governor of the British North American Provinces the earliest intelligence of the declaration of war, on the 18th June, 1812; and, had it not been for the prudent foresight of the agent of the British North-west Company at New York, who sent the intelligence by express, it is possible that the first intimation would have been received from the mouths of the American cannon. To Upper Canada Mr. Foster transmitted no notice whatever of the war, and Major-General Brock was left to learn it officially through the circuitous and dilatory channel of the Governor-General. Happily, individual diligence made up for this unpardonable neglect; and the war was known by private expresses at Montreal in Lower, and at Fort George in Upper Canada on the 24th of June, or in six days after its declaration at Washington."

ried Phœbe Willcocks. Two sons and four daughters accompanied the first Baldwin to Canada.

Willcocks had also children. We are told by Dr. Scadding (p. 138) that a William Willcocks was a pewholder in St. James' Church in 1813.

There was a third Willcocks, Charles, formerly of the Cork militia. He is mentioned by Dr. Scadding (p. 349) as having on one occasion challenged Joseph Willcocks, who failed to appear on the ground.

The Joseph Willcocks, declared with the constant positiveness of this writer to have been present at Queenston, was a member of the House of Assembly, which opened on the 27th July and was prorogued on the 5th of August, 1812. His whole conduct was antagonistic to the theory of his presence as a defender of Canada on this memorable day. With one Marcle, both of whom in a few months deserted to the United States, he did all he was able to encourage gloomy forebodings regarding the war, and it was by their influence that the House, by a majority of two, refused to pass the suspension of the habeas corpus act. Sixty-six days only elapsed from the prorogation of the House to the battle of Queenston Heights on the 13th of October, and there must have been some extraordinary change in the opinions of this Willcocks for him to be present on the British side as a volunteer. Such a proceeding would have been totally at variance with his previous career and the opinions he professed. His subsequent conduct is antagonistic with any such line of conduct. In the proceedings of the Parliament of 1814, which met on the 15th of February, both he and Marcle are named in the list of members as having "deserted to the enemy." Sheaffe called the Parliament of 1813 on the 25th of February; it lasted to the 13th of March. It was after this date he deserted, and his name nowhere appears as a loyal man. Before the fact can be admitted that he was present at Queenston much stronger evidence must be given than the imperfect report quoted by this writer, that he is to be identified with the "Willcox" named by Sir Roger Sheaffe. I still adhere to my view that he was not present.

If there be a fact in the history of the country which is established, it is that although Prevost commanded in the opera-

tions against Sackett's Harbour, on their failure he delegated to Colonel Baynes the duty of writing the despatch describing them. The despatch of Prevost, written a few days later, does not do away with the fact: a striking contrast to his conduct at Chateauguay after de Salaberry's success, of which he assumed all the merit, although not present. James, says this writer, makes the same statement. He does more. He gives the despatch itself. This writer deems it necessary to defend Prevost's personal courage. I am not aware that it has been called in question. I may refer to what is said on this point by myself (p. 270), "that in the field he was without moral courage, irresolute, ever shrinking from responsibility." The writer of this so-called review calls me to account for not recognizing the statement made by Brenton. I have not done so, for I do not consider him worthy of credit. He was private secretary to Prevost, brought with him from Halifax to fill the position from which Ryland was displaced to create the opening. All that he has written has been to vindicate the memory of his chief. His efforts in this direction were continued after Prevost's death. Thus his statements are not to be accepted in preference to the evidence of the actors in the expedition. It was Brenton who was sent to England after the disastrous retreat from Plattsburg with a despatch dated from the State of New York, although it was plain by internal evidence that it had been written in Canada.

This writer is indignant that I do not attach weight to the authority of General Brown, who commanded the United States force. He shows a constant preference in this direction. He affirms in commercial language that my statement must be discounted on what he calls concurrent evidence, that is of Prevost himself, his secretary Brenton, and the assertions of the United States General Brown, that if the retreat had not been ordered, the troops would never have regained their ships. He accuses the writers who describe this attack in different language, the writer of the pamphlet "Veritas," and James, the historian of the war, as being Prevost's personal enemies. They were no more so than any other writer who may form a view unfavourable to Prevost's public character. The opinions they expressed were based on the facts as they were related, and the defence of

Prevost made by this writer will avail little against contemporary judgment and modern investigation. He uses the words, "such writers as James, Christie and Richardson." The last named must not be confounded with the Hon. John Richardson, supposed to be the author of the letters of "Veritas." He was afterwards known as Major Richardson, at the time an officer of the 49th, and the author of a history of the war in which he took part, and of several novels and memoirs. A careful examination of these works has in my mind proved their value; that of Richardson especially, for it is the narrative of the events in which he participated. To speak of these writers as malicious, and as guided by personal feeling, is sheer nonsense, while it may be said of Brenton that he avowedly wrote to defend his patrons. With the evidence at our command I contend that my account of the operations at Sackett's Harbour is substantially correct, and that very different testimony to that advanced by this writer must be produced to prove that such is not the case.

This writer, in his attempt to give a higher reputation to Prevost than I have felt it a duty to assign him, is careful not to refer to the despatch written by him after the success of de Salaberry at Chateauguay. I must content myself with repeating what I have said on this subject (Vol. III, p. 369): "I do not know a more disingenuous production in military history than this despatch dated the 31st of October, 1813. The first consideration is why Prevost should have written it at all. The record of the action should have been made by the officer in command, de Salaberry; but he is made to bear a thoroughly subordinate position. The conduct of Prevost in this case must be contrasted with his proceeding at Sackett's Harbour. The miscarriage which followed was attributable to his own orders, but to avoid the responsibility he directed his Adjutant-General to write the despatch, confining himself to the official duty of forwarding it. In the latter case he appropriated to himself the laurels of de Salaberry, to which he had not the shadow of a claim."

Prevost's reputation has long been determined in the mind of every enlightened student of history. His government was weak and irresolute; it is a mercy that it did not prove disastrous. Except for the genius of Brock, Upper Canada would have been

taken by Hull to offer a *point d'appui* to advance on Montreal. British power would then shortly have been reduced to the citadel of Quebec, if the citadel itself could have been defended. Brock received no encouragement in his defence of Upper Canada. On the contrary, he was counselled by Prevost against all activity of campaign.* Brock's energetic and bold advance was the dictate alone of his own loyal and gallant nature. Prevost's irresolute and weak policy was that of defence. He had endeavoured to obtain an armistice until negotiations could be opened with the British government. The President declined to enter into any such arrangement. On its termination Prevost issued a proclamation. In place of speaking in the bold language of a British governor, he made an apology that the expedition against Detroit had been undertaken.† Shortly afterwards he ordered the evacuation of that post, but Brock availing himself of the discretion allowed him did not act upon the order.

After Procter's disaster at the Thames on the 5th of October, 1813, Prevost's want of courage, and of that spirit of endurance by which the battle of life is won, came prominently to the surface. He was prostrated by the news and ordered the abandonment of Burlington heights, and the retreat of Vincent's force to Kingston. I venture here to reproduce what I have said regarding this order. [p. 376.] It may be considered a specimen of the slovenly English that this writer attributes to me, sustained by Mr. Wrong's declaration, that I am not a "stylist."

"Many powerful considerations presented themselves against the movement. There were many sick both at Burlington and York (Toronto). It was the commencement of November, when heavy rains are frequent. In modern times 'as spurs the weary traveller apace to gain the timely inn,' or as he drives over a cross country road to pass from one main line of communication to another, we still have some experience of trying journeys, wherein every rod we move we dread to break the axle. In those days the main roads themselves were often impassable at the late season, and to have abandoned the heights was to have

*Prevost to Brock. Given in Tupper's *Life*, page 201.

†Tupper's *Life of Brock*, p. 442.

left the sick to the mercy of the enemy, with the ordnance, stores, baggage and provisions, which could not have been moved. The necessity of leaving the sick behind to be cared for by the invaders would have suggested the avoidance of every act which might cause irritation on their part. Thus the stores could not have been destroyed when the retreating general asked that the sick he would have left behind him might be fed and cared for. There was also the abandonment of the strong position at Burlington heights, confidently believed to be unassailable when garrisoned and provisioned. Kingston, likewise, was short of provisions at the time, and the arrival of the western force would have led to much privation and have extended to results entirely unforeseen.

In civil life there was the painful consequence of subjecting the whole population to military occupation, to the exactions, enforced contributions and remorseless severity of the United States as conquerors. A council of war was held at Burlington heights, and it was resolved not to abandon the position but to hold the ground occupied, and await events."

Prevost appropriated to himself the credit of introducing the war money bills. According to Sir. Gordon Drummond, the proposition had its origin with Commissary-General Robinson, and was simply countenanced by Prevost as Governor-General.

Plattsburg is too painful a recollection in Canada to these days to need comment. The very word is an epitaph for the chief actor in the disgrace, Sir George Prevost.

Such, briefly described, is the man, the defence of whom has been undertaken by the writer of the article, and countenanced by the Professor of History of Toronto University in a publication brought out under the auspices of the Senate. I do not conceive that the puny arguments in their pages will in any way modify the view expressed in Canadian history with regard to this personage, even if enforced in the lectures of the professor.

A similar defence is also offered for Procter, who was tried by court-martial for his disgraceful conduct on the Thames. Although the light sentence passed on him was confirmed, it was most unacceptable to the Horse Guards, and only acquiesced in, from the impossibility of reassembling the court; while the general officer commanding in Canada was desired to convey to

General Procter the Prince-regent's high disapprobation of his conduct.

Even this writer does not attempt to defend his conduct on the Thames ; he however brings into prominence, the 'energy and decision' with which the attack was made against General Winchester on the 21st of January, 1813, at Frenchtown. There is no question to be raised on this point. The objection is urged against his mode of attack. Procter's generalship led him to commence the assault of the position with 3 pdrs. Had a man like Harvey been in command he would as at Stoney Creek, have stormed the entrenchments with the bayonet, for the United States force had been surprized. The attack, having been opened by artillery, permitted the United States infantry to occupy the *banquette* from which they poured upon the advancing British troops a destructive fire. The consequence was that out of a force of 500 men 24 were killed and 158 wounded, making a total of 182 casualties.

The writer says little of the advance on Fort Meigs on the River Maumee. He, however, unwarrantably assigns the failure of Procter's attempt to his Indian contingent. He is silent with regard to the deplorable attack of Sandusky, in which Procter's deficiency in the qualities of a great commander is painfully shewn. I must follow the example given me in the cursory notice of these events by referring the reader to my volume (VIII. pp. 302-309), and by stating that I in no way modify the opinions I have expressed on these two events.

From the length which this paper is attaining I do not deem it necessary to enter into a critical examination of the battle of Chrystler's, and it is not important whether or not this writer considers some of the details a misconception, as they are given by me. The main features of the campaign remain uncontradicted.

On the points into which I have entered, I have shewn the little claim to respect the opinions of this person present, when he treats of the leading events of the war, and the characters of two of the most prominent actors in its history.

But what is to be said of the petty spite and meanness which gloats over some misprints of names and dates, plainly typographical errors, or at the worst, as shown by the text, slips

of the pen of the author? Anyone of fairness would recognize them to be errors of accident, and not make them a matter of reproach. They occur more or less in every book which contains many hundred names and dates in the 601 pp. of text. No one trained in literary work, who owes his position to his own merit and experience, but would be guided by sympathy with a work of importance exacting thought, research and continuous labour. No one, except from malignity of purpose, would think of parading his discovery of such faults with evident feelings of mean satisfaction. Many are so plainly the fault of proof-reading as to be unworthy of comment such as 95th for 98th, 44th for 49th, Baccus for Backus, Rainsfeld for Rainsford, Bambridge for Bainbridge, Fort Talbot for Port Talbot, and many such slips. I leave to the writer and the professor of history their enjoyment of the satisfaction they experience at their enumeration of mistakes, which I feel as little satisfaction in recognizing, as they are gratified in pointing out.

There is, however, an asserted error on the part of this writer and accepted by his editor which is simply astounding. It is stated that on page 130 of my volume Marcle is given by mistake for Mallory in the paragraph in which I stated that Willcocks and Marcle had deserted to the enemy. If the writer had referred to the journals of 1814, on the meeting of the house on the 15th of February, he might have read that on the roll of the members being called, six were absent: Wilson sick; McDonnell, Clench and McGregor prisoners with the enemy; while Abraham Marcle and Joseph Willcocks are mentioned as having deserted to the enemy. This correction of so-called error on the part of the writer is not the blunder of a proof reader; it is simply a proof of ignorance of the records of the Upper Canada legislature on the part of the writer and editor.

Objection is made that I have increased the number of my volumes by giving a narrative of the American revolutionary war, with a long description of the disputes with the United States which led to the declaration of war of 1812; that I have included the account of the capture of Washington, the attack on Baltimore and the battle of New Orleans; further that I have included in my history an account of the naval actions. I have to reply simply that I felt it a duty so to act. I cannot be ac-

cused of pilfering the labours of others. Even those unfriendly to me cannot arraign me for the crime of "padding out" my pages. Indeed the labour bestowed on this portion of my history was by no means of small account. The explanation I have to offer is that I considered it essential that in the Dominion we possess a correct knowledge of these events for they form a part of the history of the continent indispensable to the comprehension of our own national position.

The American revolution was the parent of the settlement of Upper Canada. The operations at Washington, and at New Orleans, with the naval actions, form a part of the war in which Canada bore so distinguished a part. Not only do I entertain no feeling of regret that I have included these narratives in my history, but I claim recognition for having rendered a national service in having written of these events so that no misrepresentation concerning them may arise. Every writer of a work of this character which has occupied upwards of ten years of his life must himself be the judge of the principles by which he will be guided. He cannot hope always to have on his side even critics friendly to him. He must throw his bread on the waters and trust to the future for the fair appreciation of his motives, and the just estimate of his labours.

This writer expresses himself arbitrarily on the point that I have failed to consult American authorities, and that there is a deficiency of notes and references. On these two points the writer is entitled to his opinion. I only consider it necessary to reply that I am not impressed with it; whatever my defects, in my own view they do not lie in this direction.

I am called in question for being deficient in allusions to the social and industrial life of the people, the condition of agriculture, the increase of commerce, the development of trade. This writer fails to bear in mind that the volume he has seen fit to call in question includes the period 1808-1815, seven years only; that it is devoted to the events which led to the war, and to the war itself. Accordingly it was not the place for such considerations. If reference be made to the other volumes, he will find these subjects treated to the extent that it is possible. If the writer has any general knowledge of Canadian history he must know that there is scanty allusion to these points in contempor-

aneous literature, and that reliable information regarding them is by no means widely given. The people of Upper Canada, in the early years of settlement, were so occupied in the struggle of life as to give little thought to "progress" in the enlarged meaning of the word, except so far as it influenced their own fortunes; and what leisure they possessed was principally occupied by the part taken by them in political life.

As to the mission of John Henry, I conceive that I have bestowed all the attention upon its details, that they call for. I do not recognize that it exercised so wide an influence as to demand a more extended allusion than I have given to it. It attracted some attention at the time in the United States and created some excitement for a long period, but it was without permanent effect. I cannot accept the view that it had great direct influence in the creation of the feeling which led to the declaration of war.

The length to which this paper has reached suggests that I should bring it to a close. There may be points in the onslaught upon my work upon which I have not touched; nevertheless I conceive that I have vindicated my claim that my record of the war of 1812 merits different consideration than has been accorded to it in the publication of Toronto university. I do not quarrel with the theory that opinions differing from mine should be expressed. Such a contradiction of view invariably presents itself in every department of literature and science. We may do our best to carry out the Horatian maxim:—" *Denique sit quidvis, simplex dumtaxat et unum.*" But, to repeat another of his sayings, "*quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.*" The best of us often fail in our purpose and but partially achieve success. I feel, however, justified by every canon of criticism in denying the assertion that I have written hastily, and without care; and that I neglected authorities which, had I consulted them, would have led me to express opinions different to those I have written.

I must concede that it would have been more desirable if the proof reader's errors of dates, and the orthography of the uncommon names, of which much is said, did not call for remark. I do not desire to explain them away; I can only regret that they present themselves to give ground for unfriendly comment.

They do not, however, constitute what is called faulty proof reading. I may say that, while my friend allowed me to appeal to his overtaxed time to watch my language and expression of thought, to correct any slip of grammar and any clumsiness of expression that might have glided into the narrative, he undertook no critical watchfulness over the dates and names only to be met in the bye-paths of historic literature. Otherwise, I had no assistance in this work. My daughter laboriously copied my MS. and aided me in the proofs in the matter of orthography, or drew my attention to that which she considered obscure. My work has been performed single-handed, under what circumstances it will little interest the reader to learn.

It was undertaken as a national work. I can with much satisfaction say that in all quarters of journalism in the Dominion it has received full recognition from writers whom I had no power of influencing. Equally in the mother country it has been as kindly received by the press of world-wide celebrity, the conductors of which knew me only by my name as appearing on the title page. In any circumstance the history certainly deserves a better fate than that accorded by the individuals who have considered it in the University publication.

I do not recognize on the part of either writer or editor the possession of the erudition, reading, or critical capacity, to enable them to judge of such a work. As the editor of an unsigned article Mr. Wrong is responsible for the opinions it expresses, justifying Prevost and Procter, which suggests a very superficial acquaintance with Canadian history. He brings to my mind Professor Truffles in the play of Douglas Jerrold of "Time Works Wonders," which half a century ago caused great attention in the theatrical world :

"What are you doing, Truffles?" asked a friend, for the Professor is supposed to have fallen on evil days."

"I am giving lectures in Chinese," answers Truffles.

"Do you know Chinese?"

"I teach it."

The text of the paper suggests that in some such spirit Professor Wrong labours at his duties in the chair of history in Toronto University, especially as it is known that he has made the slight, imperfect, sketchy, insufficient work of Greswell a text book:

a book devoid of all information, written in the spirit of a magazine article to give condensed, superficial information regarding Canada to the members of the Imperial Institute. That such a proceeding should have been admitted by the Senate, and not called in question by the minister of education seems marvellous.

Under any circumstances, even of failure, the labour bestowed upon such a work as I have now completed, the last two volumes are in the printer's hands and will appear before the close of the year, should command consideration and forbearance, even in dealing with its shortcomings. Certainly it should not be disingenuously misestimated. These two persons are the solitary instances of injustice and misrepresentation among those who have written on it.

Not simply on my own behalf, but in the cause of literature, I enter my protest against unknown men of no *status* in literature arrogantly assailing the labours of a public writer, on no ground but their own weak device ; and, what is more important, against the propagation of false, erroneous and untenable views regarding our national history ; against setting admittedly reliable evidence at defiance ; against the attempt to set up a critical house of cards doomed to be prostrated by the first breath of the contempt which it has called forth.

WILLIAM KINGSFORD.